



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8430
www.pcaobus.org

Inspection of Schwartz Levitsky Feldman LLP

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board**

April 19, 2007

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

**PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH
SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A)
OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2007-063



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") or Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP or disclosure departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



INSPECTION OF SCHWARTZ LEVITSKY FELDMAN LLP

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Schwartz Levitsky Feldman LLP ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{1/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{2/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report. In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report at all. The Board notes that it routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final report.

^{2/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted fieldwork for the inspection from July 25, 2005 to July 29, 2005, August 8 and August 9, 2005, and January 23 and January 24, 2006.^{3/} The fieldwork included procedures tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	3 (Toronto and Ottawa, Ontario; Canada, and Montreal, Quebec, Canada)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	25
Number of professional staff ^{4/}	80
Number of issuer audit clients ^{5/}	19

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits. To achieve that goal, Board

^{3/} The Board's inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Canadian Public Accountability Board.

^{4/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{5/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act.

inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP.^{6/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The scope of the inspection procedures performed included reviews of aspects of the performance of five of the Firm's audits of the financial statements of issuers. Those audits and aspects were selected according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selection process.

The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{7/} The deficiencies identified in two of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm

^{6/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP, the Board reports that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{7/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. See AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. Those deficiencies included –

- (1) the failure to perform and document an evaluation regarding an issuer's ability to continue as a going concern;
- (2) the failure to perform and document appropriate substantive procedures to test revenue; and
- (3) the failure to adequately evaluate the issuer's accounting for stock-based compensation in two audits.

Following the inspection fieldwork and the inspection team's discussion with the Firm of the matters identified above, the Firm performed additional audit procedures and an issuer subsequently restated its financial statements to address a matter described above.^{8/}

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies and procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures. As described above, any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I

^{8/} The Board inspection process did not include any review of any additional audit work or the restated financial statements.



PCAOB Release No. 104-2007-063
Inspection of Schwartz Levitsky
Feldman LLP
April 19, 2007
Page 5

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Board provided the Firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The Firm provided a written response.

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final report.

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report. In any version of this report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of the Firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted.

Schwartz Levitsky Feldman IIP
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
LICENSED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
TORONTO • MONTREAL



January 30, 2007

Mr. George H. Diacont
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC
20006

Dear Sir,

Response addressing the public portion of the report

The following statement appears under Part I, Section A, Review of Audit Engagements:

"The deficiencies identified in two of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such significance that it appears to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements."

We believe that the preceding statement may require amendment as it may only apply to one issuer, if any. Our rationale is described in detail in our response addressing the nonpublic portion of the report.

In addition, the deficiencies were primarily concentrated in the Montreal office under the direction of one partner. Subsequent to the PCAOB inspection and as a result of upgrading and improving our ongoing quality control procedures, it was determined that the Montreal office would no longer be engaged to audit issuer clients with one exception. The remaining issuer audit was reassigned to different engagement and concurring partners and is being performed under the supervision of the Toronto office.

With respect to Part I, Section B, Review of Quality Control System, it is our understanding that your assessment relied principally on the inspection of the Canadian Public Accountability Board (CPAB) in addition to your review of 5 issuer files. We believe that the actions that we have undertaken have corrected any deficiencies that we may have had in our quality control system. Furthermore, on January 27, 2006, CPAB performed a follow-up inspection to review the implementation of their recommendations.

1167 Caledonia Road
Toronto, Ontario M6A 2X1
Tel: 416 785 5353
Fax: 416 785 5663

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

Yours very truly,

SCHWARTZ LEVITSKY FELDMAN LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Ginzburg". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Per: Ralph Ginzburg, C.A.

RG/ch

1167 Caledonia Road
Toronto, Ontario M6A 2X1
Tel: 416 785 5353
Fax: 416 785 5663